

THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS IN ALABAMA

Standing Committees

By

HALLIE FARMER

Professor of

Government and History

Alabama State College for Women



BUREAU OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
UNIVERSITY, ALABAMA

1945

COPYRIGHT, 1945
BY THE
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

SET UP, PRINTED, AND BOUND BY THE
WEATHERFORD PRINTING COMPANY
TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

FOREWORD

The study which follows is the third in a series of articles which, when completed, will give a comprehensive account of *The Legislative Process in Alabama*. Earlier monographs have dealt with *Legislative Apportionment* and *Local and Private Legislation*. Others will appear during the next several months.

While the University of Alabama, as a State institution, is pleased to maintain the Bureau of Public Administration for the study of public problems, no conclusions concerning University policies or views are to be drawn from this pamphlet. The materials presented and the opinions expressed are those of the author, who accepts full responsibility for them.

ROSCOE C. MARTIN

*Director of the
Bureau of Public Administration*

STANDING COMMITTEES

INTRODUCTION

Committees are legislative devices of ancient lineage. They were in use in the British Parliament, from which all legislative bodies in the United States learned much, as early as 1340. It was natural, therefore, that the committee system should be found in the assemblies of the American colonies and that they should continue to function after independence was achieved, both in the Congress of the United States and in the legislatures of the various States.

These committees assumed a place of importance in legislatures in the United States far beyond that which they occupied in other countries. In theory, they were the agents charged with the duty of preparing business for and making recommendations to the house which created them. In practice, they often became "miniature, irresponsible legislatures,"¹ dictating the action of the body they were supposed to serve.

There were several reasons for this. Among them was the development of a government based upon separation of powers, rather than the parliamentary system, which left the legislative bodies without strong executive leadership and caused them to turn to their committees for guidance. A second reason was the increasing amount of legislation which had to be enacted as the nation developed, which forced the legislatures to rely more and more on committees as sifting devices for the parent body. Finally, the bicameral legislature made some method of ironing out differences between the two houses of the legislature imperative. Committees were found to be the best agent for doing it.

¹ *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (1931), Vol. IV, p. 43.

There are various kinds of committees. Committees may be classified, for example, on the basis of tenure, as standing (permanent) or special (select) committees. Standing committees are those chosen to serve for the life of the appointing body. Special, or select, committees are appointed to perform a specific task and are discharged when that task has been performed. Legislative committees, as opposed to non-legislative committees, are those to which proposed bills are referred for consideration. As examples, a legislative committee would be the Committee on Agriculture; a non-legislative committee would be the Committee on Enrolled Bills, which has a function other than considering and reporting on the substance of legislation. Joint committees are special committees composed of members of both houses of the Legislature. Sometimes they are named merely to perform acts of courtesy, such as notifying the executive that the Legislature is in session, or escorting a distinguished visitor into a meeting. Sometimes they are created to iron out differences between the two houses. In that case they are called conference committees. A few States (10 in 1943) have joint standing committees, but they are not in general use in legislative bodies in the United States.

Within the past few years a new committee—the recess or interim committee—has become important in some of the States. The interim committee is usually a joint committee and, as its name indicates, it sits during recesses or between sessions of the Legislature to collect information, conduct investigations, and prepare bills for presentation to that body when it comes into session.

The most important of these committees in the legislative process are the standing legislative committees. Standing committees consider proposed legislation.

Usually they determine what bills shall come before the Legislature for consideration. The standing legislative committees are the "miniature, irresponsible legislatures" referred to above. Since these committees have become such an important part of legislative machinery, no analysis of the legislative process in any State would be complete without a careful study of them. The present treatment is concerned primarily, but not entirely, with a study of the standing legislative committees in the Alabama Legislature. In addition, some attention will be devoted to other standing committees which are not legislative in character, that is, which do not have proposed bills referred to them.

From the beginning of the State's history standing committees were in use in both houses of the General Assembly. The earliest journals show 5 standing committees in the Senate and 6 in the House of Representatives. Some of those committees, such as Ways and Means, Judiciary, and Privileges and Elections, function to this day. Many committees which were once powerful and important have disappeared. For example, there is no longer a Committee on Indian Affairs, nor is there one on Divorce and Alimony; while four great committees which existed a century ago—Internal Improvements, Inland Navigation, Railroads and Roads, Bridges and Ferries—have given way to the present Committee on Public Roads and Highways.

Interestingly enough, the powerful Committee on Rules is of comparatively recent origin in the committee system of Alabama. The House of Representatives appears to have had its first standing Committee on Rules in 1878. In 1880 there was a Committee on Rules in the Senate, but it was not yet a standing committee.

The first recognition of legislative committees outside of the journals of the two houses appears in the Constitution of 1875 which provided that "no bill shall become a law until it shall have been referred to a committee of each house and returned therefrom."²

When the Constitutional Convention of 1901 considered this section of the old constitution, it was reported that committee action on bills had been very lax. Bills referred to one committee had been considered and reported on by another committee. Members of committees signed committee reports individually without any consideration of the bills by the committee in session. Local bills were not referred to committees, but were handed to the members representing the localities affected, who reported them to the house.³ In an attempt to remedy these conditions, the Convention prescribed more rigidly the procedure of committees in handling bills. It provided that no bill should become a law until it had been referred to a *standing* committee of each house, acted upon by that committee in session, and returned from that committee. The Journal must show that these requirements had been met.⁴

Although often tested in the courts, this section of the Constitution of 1901 has not been altered in any way by judicial action. The court has repeatedly held unconstitutional acts which the Journal shows were referred to one committee and reported by another.⁵ It has also held that an act is invalid if the Journals

² Art. IV, Sec. 20.

³ *Official Proceedings, Constitutional Convention of 1901, State of Alabama* (Wetumpka, 1940), Vol. II, p. 2393.

⁴ *Constitution of Alabama* (1901), Sec. 62.

⁵ *State v. Smith*, 162 Ala. 1, 50 So. 364 (1909); *Pope v. The State*, 165 Ala. 68, 51 So. 521 (1909); *Dunn v. Dean*, 196 Ala. 486, 71 So. 709 (1916).

do not show that the requirements of section 62 of the Constitution have been met.⁶

Thus by constitutional provision the position of legislative committees in Alabama was greatly strengthened, and the committees have remained the controlling agency in legislation ever since. The rules of the House of Representatives recognized the new status of the committees in 1907, when Rule 56 (included for the first time) read: "All bills acted upon by a committee shall be endorsed as follows: This bill was acted upon by the Committee on _____ in session and ordered returned to the House, and reported 'favorably' or 'adversely' or 'otherwise,' as the case may be. And said endorsement shall be signed by the chairman of such committee." The Senate adopted the same rule with only a slight variation in the wording.⁷

CHANGES IN STANDING COMMITTEES SINCE 1901

Tables I and II (see Appendix) trace the history of standing committees in each house of the Alabama Legislature for the past 40 years.

In 1903 there were 25 standing committees in the Senate and 29 in the House of Representatives. In 1943 there were 30 standing committees in the Senate and 39 in the House. In the 40 year interval 47 different committees had appeared in the House (see Table II) and 36 in the Senate (Table I). Only one of

⁶ *Tyler v. The State*, 159 Ala. 126, 48 So. 672 (1909); *Walker v. City Council of Montgomery*, 139 Ala. 468, 36 So. 23 (1903).

⁷ In 1907 the rule was 56 in the House Rules and 49 in the Senate Rules. In the House Rules of 1943, Rule 56 has been slightly changed in wording, but not in meaning. The Senate rule, now numbered 53, reads: "When a bill has been acted upon by a standing committee of the Senate, the Chairman shall endorse on said bill: 'This bill was referred to the standing committee of the Senate on _____ and was acted upon by such committee in session and is by order of the committee returned therefrom with _____. This _____ day of _____, 194____. Chairman _____,'"

the original committees (Capitol and Grounds) had disappeared from the House and one (Revision of Laws) had been dropped by the Senate.

Interesting sidelights are thrown on the social and economic history of the State by a study of the evolution of standing committees in the Legislature. Sometimes committees seem to represent a transient interest. For example, a Pure Food and Drugs Committee appeared in the House of Representatives in 1915 and never reappeared. The Senate had a standing Committee on Fees and Salaries in one session (1911). Occasionally a committee representing a transient interest develops into a committee rendering real service. In 1931 there was a standing Committee on Court-houses in the House of Representatives. It had 7 members, all of them from Jefferson County, and had only one bill referred to it during the session—a bill to provide for the building of the Jefferson County Courthouse. In 1935 the standing Committee on Court-houses had disappeared, but it had been replaced by the Committee on Local Legislation No. 2, composed of the same legislative group. That committee seems to have established itself as a permanent committee in the House; it handles all legislation relating to Jefferson County.

Sometimes standing committees reflect an ebb and flow of interest in particular problems. There is, for example, the problem of federal relations. Only once (in 1911) has the Senate had such a committee; but in the House of Representatives a recurring interest has been evidenced in this committee. It has appeared seven times, in the three sessions from 1903 to 1911 and in the four sessions since 1931.

Changes in committee names are sometimes evidences of changes in public attitudes. When the House Committee on Penitentiaries and Criminal Adminis-

tration became in 1939 the Committee on Public Welfare and Correctional Institutions, it was evidence of a revolution in the thinking of the legislators in the field of penal administration. Developments in the field of transportation may also be seen in the changes in the committee system. From 1903 to the present, the House of Representatives has had a committee on Public Roads and Highways, but the Senate did not get around to creating such a committee until 1911. In 1923 the Senate set up a Committee on Seaports, and in 1927 the House established a Committee on Rivers and Navigation. Not until 1931 was a Committee on Aviation created in the House. A similar committee was created in the Senate in 1935.

The development of industrial problems in the State is likewise reflected in committee history. One of the original committees in the House was the Committee on Mining and Manufacturing. The Senate also has a committee called Mining and Manufacturing. In 1927 the House divided its committee into two committees, one dealing with mining and one with manufacturing. The Senate has never made this separation. In similar fashion, both houses began with Committees on Banking and Insurance. Each house now has separate committees for each of these fields. In 1943 the standing committees show the growing importance of labor in the State. In that year the House of Representatives replaced its old Committee on Labor and Immigration with a standing Committee on Labor, and the Senate expanded its Committee on Immigration and Industrial Resources into a Committee on Immigration, Industrial Resources and Labor.

One of the most interesting fields in which to examine the evolution of committees is that of conservation. In 1907 both the House and the Senate

created standing Committees on Fish, Game and Forrestry (sic) Preservation. In 1927 the House of Representatives divided its committee into two committees—Game, Fish and Fisheries, and Forestry and Conservation. The Senate followed in 1935 by dividing its committees into a Fish and Game Committee and a Forestry and Conservation Committee.

The size of committees has tended to increase through the years. In 1903 the smallest committees in the House (Engrossed Bills, Enrolled Bills, Revision of the Journal) had 5 members each, the largest (Judiciary, Revision of Laws) had 23 members each. By 1931 the largest committee (Public Roads and Highways) had 47 members and there were 8 other committees with 30 or more members. In 1932 the Legislature provided by law that no standing committee of the House should have more than 15 members.⁸ Since that time only 3 House committees have consistently had less than the maximum number of members. Local Legislation No. 2 has 7 members, the entire delegation from Jefferson County. The Committee on Engrossed and Enrolled Bills has 3 members, while Revision of the Journal in recent sessions has had 9.

In the Senate the range in committee membership in 1903 was from 3 to 11. The most common size was 7 members. In 1943 the range was from 3 to 20 members. Only 2 committees had over 15 members; 9 of the 30 committees had 10 or more members; 15 had 7 members or less.

The growth in the number and size of committees made an increase in the amount of committee service required of members of the Legislature inevitable (see Table III). In 1903 there were 391 committee mem-

⁸ *Alabama General Laws, 1932* (Extraordinary Session), No. 208, p. 213.

berships in the House to be filled by 105 members. In 1943 there were 589 memberships to be filled by 106 members. The average number of committee places to be filled by each member thus increased from 3.7 in 1903 to 5.6 in 1943. These terminal figures, however, do not reflect the strong tendency toward increase in committee memberships and the recurring determination of the House to keep the total down. Considerable reductions were made in 1919 and 1935. The low point for committee memberships in the House of Representatives nevertheless was 1903, though the average of that year (3.7 places per member) was reached again in 1919; the high point was in 1931, when there were 7.5 committee places per member.

In the Senate there were 155 committee places to be filled in 1903, an average of 4.4 per member. In 1943 there were 259 committee places to be filled, an average of 7.4 per member. In contrast to the experience of the House of Representatives, the upward trend in committee memberships in the Senate has been consistent; for except for one slight reduction in 1915, each session of the Legislature has provided more Senate committee memberships than its predecessor.

The committee systems of the two houses are quite similar, for the committees of one house have in large measure duplicated those of the other from the beginning. In the 1903 session, 17 of the 25 standing committees in the Senate duplicated House committees. For the most part the names of the committees were identical, but occasionally there was a slight variation in title. For example, the House has a Committee on Printing, the Senate a Committee on Public Printing. In the 1943 session, 25 of the Senate's 30 standing committees had counterparts in the House.

Differences in the committees in the two houses result almost entirely from considerations of organiza-

tion for work and not from a difference in subject matter considered. The one exception to this is in the field of finance. Since revenue bills, under the Constitution, must originate in the House of Representatives, the House has created a Ways and Means Committee to handle revenue measures and a Committee on Appropriations to act on bills calling for the expenditure of public funds. The Senate handles both revenue and appropriation measures through its Committee on Finance and Taxation. The House also has three committees—Judiciary, Criminal Administration, and Criminal Laws—to consider bills which in the Senate are handled by the Judiciary Committee alone.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

There is nothing in the Constitution or the statutes of Alabama concerning the appointment of committees in either house of the Legislature. Each house fixes in its rules the number and the names of its standing committees. It also determines the size of each committee, with the exception of the legal limitation upon the size of the House committees already mentioned.

In the House the making of committee assignments has never been troublesome. The rules have always stated that "the Speaker shall appoint all committees unless otherwise directed by the House and may designate who shall be Chairman and Vice-Chairman." Since the Speaker is elected by a majority vote, he is by the nature of his situation on sound political grounds, and his committee appointments are never openly challenged. There is, no doubt, much compromising behind the scenes, but none of it appears on the pages of the House Journal and very little of it in the newspapers.

In the Senate the method of selecting committees was not so easily settled. The Lieutenant-Governor,

who is the presiding officer in the Senate, is not a member of that body and is not chosen by it. In the first legislative session after the adoption of the Constitution of 1901, the rules provided that the President pro Tem of the Senate, who was a member of the Senate and elected by it, should appoint the chairmen and members of the standing committees. The rule was criticised during the session, and when the Legislature met in 1907 a rule was proposed giving the Lieutenant-Governor power to appoint committees. This proposal precipitated a hot debate. Its opponents contended:

1. That the Lieutenant-Governor belonged to the executive department and that to allow him to appoint the committees was a violation of the constitutional principle of separation of powers.

2. That the Legislature was in session before it canvassed the election returns of the race for Lieutenant-Governor, and it would therefore waste time waiting for the Lieutenant-Governor to take his place as President of the Senate.

They proposed, as an alternative, a standing committee or committees to make committee assignments, subject to the approval of the Senate. In spite of the opposition, however, the rule giving the Lieutenant-Governor the power to appoint committees was adopted. In the 1911 session the President pro Tem was again authorized to make committee assignments. But in 1915 the rules provided that the Lieutenant-Governor as President of the Senate should appoint all committees, and his authority in this respect remained unchallenged from 1915 until 1939.

There might have been more conflict over this question if it had not been for the fact that, while in theory the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate appoint all committees, in actual practice the Governor has the deciding voice in the selection of

standing committees, as he does in selecting other officers of the Legislature. The Speaker and the Lieutenant-Governor traditionally have made their appointments only after consultation with the Governor. Only once, so far as the records show, has there been any serious conflict between the Governor and the Lieutenant-Governor over this matter. In 1939 the Lieutenant-Governor attempted to appoint his standing committees without consulting the Governor, claiming that the rules of the Senate gave him that responsibility. The Senate very promptly and by unanimous vote elected the nominees for standing committees submitted to it by the Governor's floor leader.⁹ In 1943 the Lieutenant-Governor, in conference with the Governor, once more appointed the Senate committees.

There are 5 committees in which the Governor is especially interested and of which he frequently selects all the members. Always he selects the chairmen and the majority of the members of these committees. They are the Rules Committees in the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Finance and Taxation Committee in the Senate, and the Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee in the House. If the Governor has a particular interest in any other committee, he may designate the members of that committee also. In fields in which he has no special interest, he may leave committee appointments entirely in the hands of the President of the Senate (Lieutenant-Governor) and the Speaker of the House.

ANALYSIS OF MEMBERSHIP ON SELECTED IMPORTANT COMMITTEES

Since the standing committees play such an important part in legislation, the membership of these

⁹ *Senate Journal*, 1939, p. 51.

committees is a matter of the greatest significance in determining legislative action.

There are so many standing committees that a study of all of them here would prove impracticable. Consequently, an analysis has been made of the major committees in each house. The Rules Committee of each house was selected because of the general control it exercises over legislative activities. The other committees were chosen because a tabulation of bills referred on first reading showed that these committees handled most of the bills introduced into the Legislature. The five major committees in the Senate are Rules, Finance and Taxation, Judiciary, Local Legislation, and Revision of Laws. Of the bills introduced into the Senate since 1901, nearly 70 per cent have been referred to these committees. In the 1943 session there was no Senate Committee on Revision of Laws. The other four committees mentioned considered two-thirds of all bills referred to committees in the Senate in that session.

Comparable committees in the House of Representatives are Rules, Appropriations, Judiciary, Local Legislation, Revision of Laws, and Ways and Means. Of all bills introduced into the House since 1901, 65 per cent have been referred to these 6 committees. In the 1943 session, nearly 60 per cent of all bills referred to committees on first reading in the House were referred to the 6 major committees named.

Urban-Rural Representation. Tables IV, V, and VI present data from which conclusions as to the urban-rural complexion of the Senate committees may be drawn. There were 11 regular sessions of the Legislature in the 40 year period from 1903 to 1943. At each of the 11 sessions each senator might have been appointed to each of the 5 major committees under study, except that the Committee on Revision of Laws

was not appointed in 1939 and 1943. There was thus a maximum of 53 possible committee appointments for each senator.

A study of the major committee appointments (Table IV) shows that the urban districts have been far better represented on the major committees than the rural districts during that period. Out of a possible 53 committee memberships, district 13 (Jefferson County) has had 27; district 28 (Montgomery County) has had 25; and districts 26 (Macon and Bullock Counties) and 2 (Lawrence and Morgan Counties) have had 22 each. At the other end of the scale, during the entire 40 year period district 16 (Lowndes) has had only 7 members on these major committees, while district 29 (Cherokee and DeKalb) and district 10 (Elmore and Tallapoosa) have had only 8 each.

If the districts are arranged in the order of the number of times they have been represented on major committees (Table V), urban predominance becomes even more evident. The 6 senatorial districts containing cities of 20,000 or more (numbers 6, 7, 11, 13, 28, and 33) have been awarded an average of 18.5 committee places per district, whereas the average for the remaining 29 districts is 13.7. At the other extreme, of the 10 districts receiving the fewest committee assignments, only district 35 contained a city of more than 10,000 (Dothan). Only 4 districts without cities of 5,000 or more are found in the heavily represented group: they are 20 (Marengo County), 22 (Wilcox County), 26 (Bullock and Macon Counties), and 32 (Greene and Hale Counties). In each of these cases the district was represented by one man over a long period of time, and length of service added to the prestige of the senators from these districts.

The influence of the urban district is seen to a degree also in the case of the assignment of com-

mittee chairmanships. A study of the chairmanships of the 5 major Senate committees (Table VI) indicates that:

1. Jefferson County is usually represented among the chairmen of important standing committees in the Senate. In only 4 of the 11 sessions has Jefferson County failed to hold the chairmanship of one of the major committees.

2. Even without regard to Birmingham, senators representing districts containing the larger cities have been assigned chairmanships more frequently than is the case with other districts. The 5 senatorial districts, exclusive of Jefferson, which contain cities larger than 20,000 have received 9 chairmanships for an average of 1.8 per district. The average of chairmanships for other senatorial districts has been 1.5. Of the 8 senatorial districts which have received no chairmanships, only district 1 (containing Florence) has a city of more than 10,000.

3. Some exceptions may be noted to the predominance of urban districts in the selection of committee chairmen, as in the case of district 20 (Marengo County) which has had 3 chairmanships, and district 26 (Bullock and Macon) which has had 4.

Tables VII, VIII, and IX analyze House committees in the same fashion in which Senate committees were analyzed in the 4 preceding tables.

The 6 major House committees are Rules, Appropriations, Judiciary, Local Legislation, Ways and Means, and Revision of Laws. From 1903 to 1943 there were 1135 places on these major committees to be distributed among the 67 counties of the State. In the House, as in the Senate, distribution favored the urban counties. Jefferson County was always represented on these committees. In the 11 sessions, the county had 102 members of the 6 major committees

(Table VIII), or about 9 per cent of all committee places. At no time was the county represented on less than 4 of the 6 committees. Montgomery County ranked second with 58 members and Mobile third with 44 members on the 6 major committees. It should be remembered, however, that Jefferson County has 7 representatives in the House, Montgomery 4, and Mobile and Dallas 3, and that no other county has more than 2. The representation per member on the important House committees for Jefferson County legislators may be derived by dividing 102 (number of committee appointments) by 7 (number of legislators). The resulting figure is 14.5.

If the figure 14.5 be used as a norm for purposes of measurement, then the comparative frequency of the assignment of important committee memberships to the various counties can be more accurately estimated. It will be seen at once that Montgomery, with 4 legislators and 58 committee assignments, and Mobile, with 3 legislators and 44 committee assignments,¹⁰ have maintained a ratio of assignments almost identical to that of Jefferson County. Of the 26 two-member counties only 5 (Calhoun, Etowah, Hale, Lee and Tuscaloosa) have equalled or exceeded the 14.5 ratio of assignments per member maintained by the counties containing the three largest cities. Of these 5 counties, Hale is the only one which does not contain a city of 5,000 or more. It is significant also that all 6 of the counties containing cities of 20,000 or more (Calhoun, Etowah, Jefferson, Mobile, Montgomery, and Tuscaloosa) have maintained a committee assignment ratio of 14.5 or better. The best average of the 6 is that of Calhoun County (Anniston), which has had 16 com-

¹⁰ It is interesting to note that Mobile County's committee representation in the House, contrary to the case of the Senate, is quite high.

mittee assignments per member. Four of the single-member counties (Colbert, Cullman, Houston, and Monroe) have received committee assignments in excess of the 14.5 ratio. Of these counties, Monroe is the only one which does not contain a city of 5,000 or more. Colbert County, with a single legislator, exceeds the average of all other counties with 20 committee assignments; Calhoun County's average mentioned above (16) is next highest.

The above figures indicate that representatives of the urban counties receive important committee assignments more frequently than do those from rural counties. This fact is emphasized further when one examines the committee assignment records for all those counties whose legislators received important committee assignments less than half as frequently as the big city norm of 14.5. Among all counties whose legislators received less than 8 important committee assignments in the 40-year period, one finds 9 single-member counties (Autauga, Blount, Cherokee, Conecuh, DeKalb, Lawrence, Limestone, Washington, and Winston); 8 two-member counties (Chambers, Clarke, Elmore, Henry, Lowndes, Pike, Walker, and Wilcox); and none of the counties with more than 2 legislators. Of the 17 counties receiving the fewest assignments, only 3 (Chambers, Pike, and Walker) contain cities of 5,000 or more. The counties which received the lowest ratio of committee assignments were Washington with 3, Lowndes with 3.5, and Autauga and Winston with 5 each. These figures seem to prove conclusively that the advantage enjoyed by urban counties in the assignment of important committee positions is quite as definite in the House of Representatives as in the Senate.

North Alabama-South Alabama Representation.
While districts with urban centers are more frequently

represented on important committees than rural districts, nevertheless rural districts, and among them South Alabama districts, really control all committees. In the case of the Senate, this is due to the fact that, in creating the senatorial districts, a larger number of districts was assigned to South Alabama than to North Alabama.¹¹ There are 20 senatorial districts in the southern half of the State and only 15 in the northern half. There are therefore more senators to be assigned to committees from South Alabama than from North Alabama, and South Alabama thus dominates important committees. From 1903 to 1943 (see Table VI) there were 508 committee places on the 5 major Senate committees: 233 of these places (about 46 per cent) went to North Alabama districts and 275 (54 per cent) went to South Alabama districts. An analysis of the individual committees shows even more definitely the control of South Alabama over the major committees in the Senate. Only 12 times out of a possible 53 times did North Alabama have a majority on one of the 5 major committees. Never in the 40 years has North Alabama had a majority of the Senate Committee on Local Legislation. On the Rules Committee, on Finance and Taxation, and on Judiciary it has had a majority 3 times. The Judiciary Committee was the only one of the major Senate committees on which North Alabama had a majority in the 1943 session.

The emphasis shifts, however, when one studies the distribution of committee chairmanships (Table VI). North Alabama has had more chairmanships of major committees than South Alabama. Of the 53 possible chairmanships, North Alabama has had 28 and South

¹¹ For the method by which the division into North and South Alabama is made, see footnote to Table VI. The data upon which the discussion of the sectional representation is based will be found in Tables VI and IX.

Alabama 25. Despite the fact that Jefferson County has had an inordinately large share of committee chairmanships, these chairmanships have been more widely distributed in North Alabama than in South Alabama. Only 2 senatorial districts in North Alabama (1 and 3) have never had a major committee chairmanship. In South Alabama, 6 senatorial districts (10, 14, 16, 18, 23, and 27) have never had a major chairmanship.

In the House of Representatives, as in the Senate, more memberships on the major committees go to South Alabama than to North Alabama (see Table IX). South Alabama has had 625, or 55 per cent, while North Alabama has had 510, or 45 per cent, of the memberships on the 6 major committees. Chairmanships, however, tend to go to North Alabama. Out of 64 possible chairmanships North Alabama has had 36 (56 per cent) and South Alabama has had 28 (44 per cent). Not only have the chairmanships of the major committees gone to North Alabama, but they have been concentrated in the urban counties of the section. Jefferson County has held 10 of the 36 chairmanships assigned to North Alabama. Colbert County (Sheffield, Tuscumbia) has had 5. Calhoun (Anniston) and Morgan (Decatur) have had 4 each, and Etowah (Gadsden) has had 3. In other words, 5 counties have had 26 of the 36 North Alabama chairmanships. Stated in percentages, 17 per cent of the counties have had 72 per cent of the chairmanships held in the section. There are 16 counties in North Alabama which have never had a major committee chairmanship.

In South Alabama the concentration of chairmanships has not been so great. Nevertheless, 24 of the 38 counties in that section have never had a major committee chairmanship. The maximum number of chair-

manships held in any one county is 4: Montgomery and Mobile Counties have had 4 chairmanships each.

An analysis of membership on the individual major committees to determine sectional representation indicates clearly the control which South Alabama exercises over the Legislature. In one session (1935) North Alabama had a majority on 5 of the 6 committees: in no other session did it have a majority on more than 2. In the 1943 session North Alabama controlled 2 committees—Judiciary and Local Legislation. In 5 of the 11 regular sessions since 1903, North Alabama has controlled the Committee on Rules, but did not do so in 1943.

Occupational Representation. An additional factor of interest in studying the membership of legislative committees is the business interests of the committee members. This is not an easy thing to analyze. For one thing, the data furnished in the *Alabama Official and Statistical Register*, upon which such a study must be based, is incomplete. Some members of the Legislature have not supplied the data upon which to base an analysis. Moreover, many members of the Legislature have a variety of interests and may fail to mention some of them. For example, a banker may own farms and be interested in agriculture, but his biographical statement in the *Register* may not mention it. Despite the paucity of information, some pertinent facts are discernible.

There are a few standing committees in each house of the Legislature which throw some light on this question of occupational representation on committees. The only doctor in the Legislature in 1943 was chairman of the Committee on Public Health in the Senate. The Chairman of the Military Committee in both the House and the Senate had had some military training. There was one trade union member in the lower house.

He was not on the Labor Committee. In each house the chairman of the Committee on Insurance was interested in insurance; but the majority of the members of this committee in the Senate were lawyers. In the House a variety of occupations was represented.

The only occupation which seemed to dominate the committee which legislated for it was the Committee on Banking in the Senate. Nine of the 15 members of this committee described themselves as bankers. While the chairmen of the Agriculture Committees of both houses describe themselves as farmers or planters and while farmers are well represented on those committees, they do not dominate the committees.

Occupational representation in the Legislature of Alabama probably will not be significant until the number of lawyers in proportion to the number of representatives of other occupations is reduced, for the predominance of lawyers of necessity makes for underrepresentation of other occupations. It is worth noting that few members of the Legislature with whom this matter was discussed seemed to attach much weight to the matter of occupational representation. One influential member expressed the opinion that it would be a good thing if you could have committees represent the occupation for which legislation was to be enacted. Another well known member, however, expressed the opposite view.

Seniority. Seniority also plays some part in committee selection. In the 1943 session the chairman of each of the 5 major committees in the Senate had had previous legislative experience. The chairman of the Committee on Finance and Taxation was serving his fourth term in the Legislature. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee was serving his third term, as was the chairman of the Rules Committee. Since it is the custom in Senatorial districts composed of more

than one county to select the Senator from a different county at each election, this tendency toward recognition of seniority enhances the strength and influence of the one county districts. Of the 4 major committees of the Senate in 1943, 3 had chairmen from single county districts. The majority of the members of the Committee on Rules had served more than one term in the Legislature, but that was not true of the members of the other major committees.

In the House, 24 of the 40 committee chairmen had served more than one term in the Legislature. The Speaker (Chairman of the Rules Committee) was serving his fifth term, and the chairmen of the other 5 major committees were each serving their second term.

The Influence of Pressure Groups. Even more difficult to measure than the weight given to occupational interests and seniority in committee appointments is the influence of outside pressure on the appointing of committees. There is no way to measure this pressure, of course, but thoughtful members of the Legislature, who have had many years of experience, are inclined to give it great weight. Some of them say that this pressure is far greater than those outside the Legislature realize, that it reaches back into the campaigns for election of the appointing officials. More than one member stated that pledges of support for a candidate for governor would be accompanied by such statements as, "All I want is to name the chairman [or the majority of the members] of the Blank Committee." This comment is significant not only from the point of view of pressure groups, but also as further evidence of the dominant position occupied by the Governor in assigning important committee memberships and of the weight attached to such memberships. Obviously the major share of whatever

pressure is exerted by interest groups is channeled through the Governor's office.

LEGISLATIVE CONTROL OF COMMITTEES

The organization of standing committees in the Alabama Legislature is very simple. Each committee has a chairman and a vice-chairman appointed in the same manner as the other members of the committee, except that the rules of the House have always required that the Speaker be the Chairman of the Rules Committee.

Once appointed, legislative committees have always been largely free from control by the house which they are supposed to serve. Prior to 1907, committees were not even required to report bills on which they had acted adversely. Such bills were retained by the chairmen of the committees. In 1907 the adverse calendar was first set up in both the House and the Senate.

The Senate rules in the 1943 session contain the following provisions regarding committees of the upper house:

1. The Committees on Rules, on Enrolled and Engrossed Bills, and on Journal may report at any time.
2. When a committee has acted a bill adversely, it must report the fact to the Secretary of the Senate who places the measure on the adverse calendar.

The rules of the House of Representatives provide that:

1. The Committees on Rules, Enrolled Bills, and Engrossed Bills may report at any time.
2. A majority of a committee constitutes a quorum.
3. When a committee has decided adversely on any bill it must report that fact to the House.
4. No committee may sit while the House is in session without special permission.
5. When the chairman of a committee is sick or

absent, the vice-chairman, or the member whose name appears second on the committee list, becomes chairman.

6. Upon vote of a majority of the whole House, any standing committee may be directed to act on any bill which has been referred to it, and to report its action to the next meeting of the House.

7. The House may withdraw a bill from one committee and refer it to another, or it may recommit the bill to the same committee for further action.

Although the Senate rules appear to be more lax than those of the House, the upper house actually follows about the same procedures as the lower. An examination of the actual practices followed in both houses indicates that neither exercises any real control over its committees. In the Senate no committee is required by rule to have a quorum for the transaction of business. No committee in either house is required to hold regularly scheduled meetings for the consideration of business. No committee is required to act on the bills referred to it. No committee is required to keep any record of its proceedings.

In theory, of course, either house may bring its committees under control at any time by altering its rules. In practice, the Legislature of Alabama is at the mercy of its committees. The Legislature acts only on such bills as the committees see fit to return to it. The rule of the House setting forth the procedure by which a committee may be required to report a bill is very rarely used. Neither house seems to chafe under the dominance of its committees; on the contrary, legislators apparently take comfort in resigning their responsibilities to the splintered sovereignties of the standing committees.

It should be said that, at least in the major committees, the ordering of the committees is better than

the gaps in the rules would lead one to expect. Roll is called in the larger committees and a quorum apparently is considered necessary for the transaction of business in every committee. Votes are taken on controversial measures, usually by show of hands. However, no records seem to be kept of committee action other than the records of the action on bills.

BILLS REFERRED TO COMMITTEES

An important aspect of the committee system is reflected in the quantity of work done by the committees in terms of the number of bills referred to them. The performance of committees of the Legislature at its regular sessions since 1903 in terms of number of bills handled is recorded in Tables X and XI. In some respects the data upon which this analysis is based are incomplete. Both Senate and House bills referred to each committee are included, but bills re-referred are not included. While in each session there are some bills which are recalled from one committee and referred to another, the number of such bills is not large enough to affect the total picture of the work of any committee, except in the case of the Senate Committee on Taxation and Finance.¹² There are errors in and omissions from the Journals. In almost every session, the careers of some bills cannot be traced. Moreover, in examining such large numbers of bills, it is too much to hope that some errors have not crept in. In spite of these limitations, certain important facts concerning the distribution of bills among the committees can be determined.

Probably the most significant fact that appears

¹² Since 1915 the Senate has had a rule that all bills carrying appropriations, whether previously referred to another committee or not, shall be referred to the Committee on Taxation and Finance. This Committee, therefore, receives most of the bills re-referred in the Senate and has actually considered more bills than the table indicates.

from a study of the tables is that there is gross inequality in the distribution of work among the committees. In the Senate in 1943, 10 committees handled 88 per cent of the bills and the 14 other committees handled the remaining 12 per cent. In the House of Representatives in 1943, 10 committees handled almost 77 per cent of the bills introduced, leaving the remaining 24 committees to handle some 23 per cent of the bills.

The most overworked committee in both the Senate and the House is the Judiciary Committee. Since 1903 the Judiciary Committee of each house has considered more than 21 per cent of all bills referred to committees. The Committee on Local Legislation ranks next to the Judiciary Committee in the number of bills referred to it. However, since the Committees on Local Legislation do not really consider the bills referred to them, the number of bills is not a fair measure of the amount of work done by those committees.

Some committees do not seem to have justified their creation, if they are to be judged by the amount of work done. Consider, for example, the Senate Committee on Immigration, Industrial Resources and Labor. This committee has been appointed at each session. In 11 sessions extending over 40 years it has considered 11 bills. In 7 sessions it has not had a single bill referred to it. The Senate Committee on Aviation and Traffic, created in 1935, has considered one bill at each session since its establishment. In 1923 the House of Representatives set up a standing Committee on Rivers and Navigation. Although it had two bills referred to it in 1923, one in 1927, and none since, it was still a committee in good standing in 1943.

On the whole it would seem that both houses might well consider a reorganization of their whole committee system with a view to relieving the few over-burdened

committees and to securing a fairer distribution of work.

It should be pointed out that there are factors other than the consideration of bills which have at times entered into the creation of legislative committees. The chairmanship of a committee *per se* has some value to a member of the Legislature. Properly advertised it may increase his prestige in his home community. Under some circumstances it may increase the respect with which his fellow legislators regard him. If he aspires to a political career, a committee chairmanship may be a device to attract public attention and further that career. Finally, committee chairmanships have sometimes been the coin in which political debts have been paid. Obviously, the more committee chairmanships there are, the more purposes can be served. This clearly is no justification for the existence of unnecessary committees; it is rather an explanation of their creation. Perhaps the first question which the Legislature should consider, therefore, is the real purpose of each of the committees. Once that question has been answered, the problem of committee reorganization will be greatly simplified.

COMMITTEE ACTION ON BILLS

In the first session of the Legislature after the adoption of the Constitution of 1901, a member of the Senate explained the purpose of committees in the Legislature:

A committee is the eyes and ears, to a very large extent, of the legislative body and sits for the very purpose of hearing both sides of every controversy, which, in the nature of things, the Senate itself cannot fully do The Legislature must largely depend upon the action of committees and is governed by their opinion as to the merits of a bill, unless for some special reason the members of the Senate entertain other views.¹³

¹³ Senator Goldsby: *Senate Journal*, 1903, p. 1738.

Forty years later this statement stands as a very clear explanation of the purpose of standing committees in the State Legislature. The theory of the standing committee has not changed. In practice the Committee has become something far different from what Senator Goldsby believed it to be in 1903. It is possible, even, that the standing committee today is something different from what the members of the Legislature believe it to be. According to students of legislative procedure, when a bill has been referred to a standing committee any one of six things may happen to it. It may:

1. Be reported favorably.
2. Be reported favorably with amendments.
3. Be reported favorably with a substitute.
4. Be reported without recommendation.
5. Be reported adversely.
6. Not be reported at all.

In the Alabama Legislature, committee action does not quite follow the accepted pattern (see Tables XII and XIII). The vast majority of bills are either reported favorably or not reported at all. A small percentage are reported adversely. Of the 11,657 bills introduced in the Senate between 1903 and 1943, 7,846 (about 67 per cent) were reported favorably. Of the 14,311 bills introduced in the House of Representatives from 1907 to 1943, 8,802 (some 61 per cent) were reported favorably. During the same period, 1,800 bills (over 15 per cent) were not reported at all in the Senate, and 2,128 (15 per cent) were not reported in the House.

An alternative to a favorable report is an adverse report. Since 1907, 674 bills (nearly 6 per cent) in the Senate and 1,909 bills (over 13 per cent) in the House of Representatives have been so reported. Approximately 10 per cent of the bills introduced in each house

during the entire period have been reported with amendments or with substitutes. The percentage of bills which have been reported without recommendation by both houses has been negligible.

In the accompanying table a comparison is made between the record of the 1943 session and the near-40 year average. It is at once apparent that a considerably

COMMITTEE ACTION, 1943 SESSION AND FORTY YEAR AVERAGE

Action Taken	Per Cent of Total			
	Senate		House	
	1943	Average 1907-1943	1943	Average 1907-1943
Reported				
favorably	70.3	66.9	70.6	61.0
as amended	6.5	7.4	5.4	6.3
with substitute	2.9	2.8	3.2	3.1
without recommendation..	1.8	1.3	0.4	0.8
adversely	1.7	5.8	0.9	13.2
Not reported	16.8	15.8	19.5	15.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

larger percentage of bills was reported favorably in 1943 than over the whole period. The committees of both houses have shown a definite tendency away from adverse reports, with decreases of 4 percentage points in the Senate and 12 in the House. This reduction is compensated for in each case by increases in the number of bills reported favorably and not reported at all. The most logical explanation of this trend would seem to be that it is more convenient to ignore a bill than to prepare an adverse report. And yet a further examination of the figures discloses that the greater part of the decrease in adverse reports is accounted for by the increase in the percentage of favorable reports. The larger percentage of bills reported favorably in 1943 may be attributable to improved bill drafting and to the growing influence of administrative

departments in legislative matters. Whatever the explanation, the adverse report has practically disappeared in Alabama.

The tendency, evident in the Senate but much more marked in the House, is to report favorably all bills referred to the committees or not to report them at all. Bills nowadays are amended less than formerly by the committees. At least two veteran legislators lament that members of the Legislature and especially committee members do not study legislation as they once did. They are inclined to attribute it to the carelessness and slipshod habits of the younger generation. Whatever the explanation, the trends are evident.

The number of bills never reported at all by the committees gives rise to a serious question concerning committee procedure. The committee, by expressing no opinion at all concerning a bill, has become its executioner. The Legislature itself never has an opportunity to act upon a large percentage of the bills introduced. In a very real sense the committee has become the Legislature—"a miniature, irresponsible legislature." It is performing an act which many believe should be performed by the house of which it is supposed to be the servant. If bills received careful consideration at the hands of the committees to which they are referred, the situation would not be so serious. For most bills, however, committee consideration is most casual. "Discussion" consists of a brief explanation of the bill, either by the member who introduced it or by a member of the committee who feels that he is sufficiently informed to explain it. Occasionally bills are referred to subcommittees for further investigation. If the records of the committee books are to be accepted, this is frequently a device for killing a bill. There is rarely a record of a report or any further action on a bill so referred. Action on bills for the most

part apparently is the result of first impressions, not of reasoned consideration.

In fairness to the major committees, swamped as they are with 60 per cent or more of all bills introduced, it should be said that it is hard to see how they could give anything like adequate consideration to the bills before them. While this defense cannot be offered for the committees to which few bills are referred, something can be said for the individual members of committees. That it is difficult if not impossible for legislators to give adequate consideration to bills is easily understood by anyone who has watched individual members trying to attend two or three committee meetings at the same time, slipping into a room long enough to be counted for a quorum and then scurrying across the hall for the same purpose in another committee, or rushing in long enough to cast a vote in one committee and dashing out to vote in another. Understanding of the conditions, however, does not alter the fact that slipshod committee work makes for grave shortenings in lawmaking.

On a few bills which come before the committees, "hearings" are held. Such hearings are very rarely denied if anybody asks for them. Sometimes these hearings are spectacular staged performances, marked by crowded galleries, oratory, and enthusiasm. Committeemen listen to the performance very patiently. They rarely, if ever, question any of the material presented. Privately many of them admit that for influencing legislation such hearings are quite useless.

The influence which is really effective in getting a committee to consider a bill is the personal solicitation of an interested legislator or influential citizen. Anyone who has observed committees in session is quite familiar with the spectacle of legislators and citizens striving to secure consideration for a favorite measure.

Needless to say, the bills which are reported by this method are not always those most freighted with public interest.

Another factor which has great weight with committees is the influence of the government agencies, if any, affected by proposed legislation. It is a rare department which is not represented in the committee room when legislation in which it is interested comes before a committee. If by any chance the department is not represented, it is fairly certain to secure reconsideration of committee action if it so desires. Conferences between administrators and influential committee members outside the committee room are also common practice, as discussions in committee meetings reveal.

The truth is that committees in considering legislation are handicapped in three ways: first, by the flood of bills which they are required to consider; second, by their lack of familiarity with the fields in which they are expected to legislate; and third, by their lack of adequate clerical staff. The flood of legislation prevents any adequate consideration of most of the bills before them. This fact must in some measure excuse the practice of killing large numbers of bills by neglect. The bills which are politically significant, or at least those which have wide support, usually find their way back to the house. One reform that would ease the pressure of committee work would be a more even distribution of bills to the various committees. This would involve a redefinition of committee competence and the adoption of a conscious reference policy on the part of presiding officers.

The legislators themselves are the first to admit their lack of acquaintance with many of the fields in which they must legislate. Of necessity, they must depend upon outside sources for information. Fre-

quently this information comes from the more enterprising individuals who are to be affected by the proposed legislation. In matters affecting the executive departments, and in the absence of technicians of their own, committees have little choice save to recognize as experts the representatives of the administrative agencies. The obvious solution to this dilemma, despite the obstacles involved, would be for the committees to acquire expert staffs of their own. Only so can they avoid the constant danger of being misled, either through wilfull misrepresentation or through failure to achieve a balanced view of a problem.

The need of skilled clerical assistance needs no elaboration here. Competent assistance in handling its business—keeping records, keeping up with bills, preparing agenda, and the like—would undoubtedly increase markedly the efficiency of committee performance. Certain it is that no attempt to remedy the committee system of the Alabama Legislature will succeed unless it moves to meet the problems here discussed.

OTHER STANDING COMMITTEES

There are a few standing committees in each house of the Legislature which are essential parts of the legislative machinery, but which give little or no time to the consideration of bills on first reading. They are not, in other words, *legislative* committees as such. Three of these committees may be dismissed with a few words of explanation. The Senate has a Committee on Engrossed Bills and a Committee on Enrolled Bills. In the House the duties performed by these two Senate committees are handled by a single Committee on Engrossed and Enrolled Bills. The work of these committees is essentially that of proof reading: They are responsible for the textual accuracy of bills. Most of the actual work is performed in the offices of the

Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House, but these committees report engrossed and enrolled bills to their respective houses and are officially responsible for them.

A committee with similar duties is the Committee on Revision of the Journal, found in each house, which is responsible for the accuracy of the Journal. Since the Supreme Court has ruled that the Journal is the final authority as to actions of the Legislature, its accuracy is a matter of considerable importance. As in the case of the Committees on Enrolled and Engrossed Bills, most of the work of these committees is performed in the offices of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House.

Under the rules, any of the Senate Committees mentioned above may report at any time. In the House this privilege is granted only to the Committee on Enrolled and Engrossed Bills. The Committee on the Revision of the Journal must report when it is called upon in the regular order of business.

The most important standing committee in each house is the Committee on Rules, which serves as a steering committee. In the Senate, the Chairman is selected by the President (in consultation with the Governor); in the House, the Speaker is designated by the rules as the Chairman of the Rules Committee. In each house this committee may report at any time. Not many bills are referred to the Rules Committee, but in most sessions it considers a few, dealing usually with salaries of clerks, number of clerks, and similar matters. In the House all resolutions must be considered by the Rules Committee before they are voted upon, and in the Senate all resolutions which do not require immediate action must also be referred to the Rules Committee. Occasionally other bills are referred to the Rules Committee. Apparently these are bills in

which the Chairman or some other member of the Committee has a direct interest.

The Rules Committee is, of course, a powerful committee and it may rule the house it serves with an iron hand. Since Alabama is a one-party State, its work is not as arduous as it would be in a State where it represented a majority party faced by a resolute and powerful minority. The Committee wields most power when the end of the session rush begins. Then, meeting at least once each day, it determines the order in which bills on the calendar shall be considered. Thus most of the bills which do not come from the calendar die there by virtue of the decision of the Rules Committee. Like all other committees, its rulings are subject to review and revision by the house it represents. In practice, however, its decisions are almost never questioned.

CONCLUSION

No one who has followed this discussion would contend that the committee system of the Alabama Legislature is so organized as to contribute in the highest measure to the effectiveness of legislative action. What are the major shortcomings which this study has revealed?

1. *There are too many committees.* Many of the weaknesses of the committee system spring from this fact. No man can possibly give intelligent attention to the work of 7 committees, as he is sometimes expected to do in the Senate, or even of 5 committees, as he may be expected to do in the House of Representatives. A reduction in the number of committees would make possible more effective work. Such a reduction, this study shows, is not impossible. It could be achieved in any one of the following ways:

- a. Since there is so much duplication in the work of the committees of the two houses, great improvement and a saving of time would result from the creation

of joint standing committees. The interim committees are proving the efficiency of this method of organization. Moreover, this method has been tested in other States and found satisfactory. Many States make use of joint standing committees, and in three (Connecticut, Maine, and Massachusetts) all committees for the consideration of bills are joint committees. In Massachusetts, for example, each house has separate standing committees on rules, engrossed bills, and enrolled bills; and all others are joint committees. Such committees reduce the number of committee assignments, avoid the time-consuming process of introducing duplicate bills in each house, and make duplicate hearings unnecessary.

b. If joint standing committees are not deemed desirable, the number of committees in each house could be reduced by abolishing committees that have outlived their usefulness and by consolidating those to which few bills have been referred over a period of years. For example, the House of Representatives has 5 committees (Aviation, Commerce and Common Carriers, Public Roads and Highways, Rivers and Navigation, and Seaports, Harbors and Maritime Commerce) each of which is concerned with some phase of transportation. One committee on transportation could be substituted for all five committees. A similar consolidation of the Senate committees on Aviation and Traffic, Commerce and Common Carriers, Public Roads and Highways, and Seaports could be made. Single committees on business in each house might well do the work now performed by the Committees on Banks and Banking, Insurance, Corporations, Manufacturing, and Mines and Mining. This study reveals no justification for a Committee on County and County Boundaries and another Committee on County Organization in the House of Representa-

tives. Moreover, if one committee can handle engrossed and enrolled bills in the House why are two committees necessary to perform the same services for the Senate?

c. Perhaps a more effective method of reducing the number of committees would be to set up one committee for each of the major executive departments. There is a clearly defined trend in Alabama toward cooperation between the departments and the Legislature. Committees might thus be organized on a more nearly functional basis. Some committees, such as Education, Public Health, and Agriculture, are already so organized. Perhaps a frank recognition of this trend and the creation of more committees of this sort would make for more efficient legislative action. Legislative standing committees which do not fit into this pattern could be eliminated. Such a reform might entail a wholesale readjustment of the jurisdiction or competence of such committees as judiciary, appropriations, and revision of laws, since these committees are in no sense functional in scope. It should be pointed out that it is not the purpose here to propose a finished plan for reducing the number of standing committees in the Legislature. Such a plan could be made for the house concerned only after a careful consideration of the whole problem. It should be further emphasized that the major reason for reducing the number of committees is to reduce the amount of committee service required of members of the Legislature in order that they may give more careful consideration to the work of the committees to which they are assigned.

2. *Many committees are too large.* The pressure for larger committees arises from two convictions which seem to prevail among the members of the Legislature: first, that every member should serve on more than one committee, and, second, that membership on committees makes it possible to get favors for the

district or county which a member represents. It is no accident that the large committees in the Senate are Education (20 members) and Judiciary (17 members). In the House of Representatives in 1931, which was the last session before the law limiting the size of House committees to 15 members was passed, the Committee on Public Roads and Highways had 47 members and the Committee on Education had 43. These are the committees through which much of the legislation providing for expenditure of State funds in local communities is sifted. Committee members are believed to have special influence with the departments most affected by the legislation which passes through their committees. Large committees give a larger number of communities a chance to press their own immediate interests. Any effort, however, in the direction of giving localities representation on a system of functional committees is based on mistaken assumptions. Whatever advantages such representation might bring are far outweighed by the confusion engendered.

How large should a standing committee be? The answer to this question can never be a fixed number. The law passed in 1932 fixing the maximum number of members on any committee in the House of Representatives at 15 no doubt represented a healthy reaction to an overgrown committee system. An inspection of standing committees in the House in 1943 shows, however, that the maximum had become the minimum and that only 5 committees contained fewer than 15 members. There is little question that some committees need to be larger than others. Alabama's legislative history indicates the Legislature's inability to keep the size of the committees down in any fashion save by periodic massive strokes. The 1932 law, therefore, does offer one practical approach to the problem. The principal concern must be that the number both of committees

and of committee memberships be kept low in order to minimize the number of committee assignments per member. With this in mind, it would seem that a maximum size should be provided in the rules of each house, and that each house should authorize its Rules Committee to set a smaller number wherever feasible.

3. *Work is not properly distributed among the committees.* Some are overworked and some have too little to do. This is probably due to the fact that the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House refer bills after hearing the titles read while the Senate and the House are in session. The result is that speed is attained at the sacrifice of proper distribution. It appears, furthermore, that the presiding officers, whether for political reasons or from force of habit or both, tend to refer bills to a few important committees to the neglect of others. It is quite natural, for example, for a presiding officer to refer all bills making appropriations to the Appropriations Committee; or to refer increasing numbers of bills to a committee in whose members he has confidence. One solution to the problem, therefore, is to channelize more definitely in the rules the presiding officer's power to refer bills: limit the jurisdiction of such committees as Appropriations and Judiciary and elaborate and simplify the procedure whereby private members may appeal from the presiding officer's action in referring bills. Another solution which has been used in some States is to send all bills on first reading to a standing committee on reference of bills on first reading. This committee examines the bills and refers them to the proper committees. With the provision of adequate guides in the rules, such a committee could effect a proper distribution of bills.

4. *The rules of both House and Senate could be revised to provide more effectively for the work of the*

committees. Such matters as quorums and records of committee action might be covered by the rules. A calendar of committee meetings could be set up fixing specific times for committee meetings. A rule requiring a report from the committee on all bills referred to it should be considered. Furthermore, the whole system of supplying clerical assistance to the committees needs to be examined. Much of the routine inefficiency which is charged to the standing committees is traceable to the fact that they have too little effective clerical and stenographic help. It is clear beyond question that the time of committee members is too valuable to be spent in routine clerical work. Some method of providing this assistance, even if only a stenographers' pool, should be devised.

5. *Finally, the committees must have more effective means of acquiring knowledge of the bills upon which they act.* This need for knowledge appears most clearly in the committee room. Lacking any other source of knowledge, the committees turn constantly to the executive departments. This reliance on the executive branch makes impossible any effective control of the executive by the Legislature. The Legislature should have specialists of its own, who should be selected by and responsible to the legislative body. Adequately supplied with information by its own technicians, the Legislature may move forward with confidence to the assumption of those responsibilities which properly belong to it in a democratic society.

APPENDIX
TABLES

TABLE I
SENATE: SIZE OF STANDING COMMITTEES, 1903-1943

[illegible]

[illegible]

- 1 Including Accounts and Claims, Fees and Salaries, and Contingent Fund.
2 Including Charitable Institutions.
3 Including Grievances, Disabilities and Registration.
4 Made into two committees in 1911, with a single committee again in 1935.
5 Mining and Manufactories (sic) changed to Mining and Manufacturing.
6 Original name of Game, Fish and Forestry (sic) Preservation changed to Forestry Conservation and
7 Preservation of Game.
8 Name changed to Counties and County Boundaries.
9 Name changed to Fish, Game and Forestry.
10 Name changed to Mines and Manufacturing; changed to Mining and Manufacturing in 1935.
11 Rules state that there are 15 members of this committee but only 13 names are listed in the Journal.
12 Report of the Committee on Rules says that there are 19 members on the committee; only 17 names are
13 listed in the Journal.
14 Name changed to Municipalities; changed to old name in 1939.
15 Name changed to Fish and Game. A new committee on Forestry and Conservation created.
16 This committee had bills referred to it in the special session of 1932 and also in the special session of
1933, but this is the first time it appears in the list of standing committees. No record of its creation
appears in any of the journals.
Name changed to Immigration, Industrial Resources and Labor.
Name changed to Health.

TABLE II
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: SIZE OF STANDING COMMITTEES, 1903-1943

Committee	1903	1907	1911	1915	1919	1923	1927	1931	1935	1939	1943
1. Judiciary	23	21	21	22	19	21	25	32	15	15	15
2. Revision of Laws	23	21	21	15	19	19	25	30 ⁹	15	15	15
3. Ways and Means	21	19	19	21	23 ²	19	27 ²	34	15	15	15
4. Privileges and Elections	19	19	19	19	15	15	15	16	12	15	15
5. Education	19	19	19	19	19	20	30	43	15	15	15
6. Commerce and Common Carriers	15	19	19	19	18	18	20	19	15	15	15
7. Agriculture	19	19	19	19	23	23	31	31	15	15	15
8. Temperance	13	19	19	19	19	21	27	22	15	15	15
9. Local Legislation	19	19	19	19	19	19	22	34	15 ¹¹	15	14
10. Appropriations	13	15	15	15	16	16	15	19	15	15	15
11. Corporations	13	15	15	15	16	16	13	30	15	15	15
12. Penitentiaries and Criminal Administration	15	15	15	15	15	15	13 ³	15	15	15	15
13. Municipal Organization	13	15	15	15	15	15	13	15	15	15	15
14. Banks and Banking	15	15	15 ¹	15	15	15	17 ⁴	21	15	15	15
15. Labor	13	15	15	15	15	15	11 ⁵	15 ⁵	10	15	15 ¹⁵
16. Public Roads and Highways	15	15	15	15	19	25	28	47	15	15	15
17. Mines and Mining	15	15	15	15	11	11	19 ⁶	15	15	15	15
18. County and County Boundaries	13	15	15	15	11	9	13	11	15	15	15
19. Public Health	13	13	13	15	15	15	16	18	15	15	15
20. Military	13	13	13	13	13	14	15	19	15	15	15
21. Public Buildings and Institutions	13	13	13	13	12	11	12	13	15	15	15

[illegible]

TABLE II (Continued)

Committee	1903	1907	1911	1915	1919	1923	1927	1931	1935	1939	1943
46. Court Houses -----								7	7	7	7
47. Local Legislation No. 2 -----								14	13	15	15
48. County Organizations -----											
49. Public Welfare and Corrective Institutions -----										15	15

- 1 Insurance made a separate committee in 1911; included with Banking again in 1915.
2 Became Ways, Means, and Appropriations; Appropriations set up again as a separate committee in 1927.
3 Penitentiaries only; Criminal Administration thereafter a separate committee.
4 Original name of Banking and Insurance changed to Banks and Banking; Insurance and Insurance Companies thereafter a separate committee.
5 Original name of Labor and Immigration changed to Labor. Immigration made a separate committee for the 1927 and 1931 sessions and abandoned thereafter.
6 Original name of Mining and Manufacturing changed to Mines and Mining; Manufacturing thereafter a separate committee.
7 Original name Fish, Game, and Forestry (sic) Preservation changed to Game, Fish and Fisheries; Forestry and Conservation thereafter a separate committee.
8 Original name of Soldiers' Home and Pensions changed to Pensions; Soldiers' Home made a separate committee.
9 Name changed to Civil Laws; changed back to Revision of Laws in 1935; in Journal a typographical error made it "Division of Laws."
10 Original name changed to Federal Relations and Representation.
11 This became Local Legislation No. 1. Local Legislation No. 2 was created to take care of Jefferson County legislation.
12 The Committees on Rivers and Navigation and Claims and Fees were to be named later, but they were never named.
13 Name changed to Engrossed and Enrolled Bills.
14 Name changed back to Pensions and Soldiers' Home.
15 Original name changed to Labor.

TABLE III
TOTAL COMMITTEE POSITIONS AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF
POSITIONS PER MEMBER, 1903-1943

Year	House of Representatives		Senate	
	Total Committee Memberships	Average Number of Positions per Member	Total Committee Memberships	Average Number of Positions per Member
1903.....	391	3.7	155	4.4
1907.....	420	4.0	162	4.6
1911.....	446	4.2	200	5.7
1915.....	426	4.0	184	5.3
1919.....	393	3.7	184	5.3
1923.....	400	3.8	194	5.5
1927.....	627	5.9	214	6.1
1931.....	797	7.5	226	6.5
1935.....	564	5.3	245	7.0
1939.....	561	5.3	255	7.3
1943.....	539	5.6	259	7.4

TABLE IV
SENATE: COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS BY DISTRICTS ON FIVE MAJOR COMMITTEES, 1903-1943

District	1903	1907	1911	1915	1919	1923	1927	1931	1935	1939 ¹	1943	Totals
1.	f	c	b	c	fd	cd	bfa	beca	a	bfd	b	15
2.	b	fed	Cd	fda	a	bed	bf		fd	bfa	da	22
3.	ba	c	c	bd	bc	fc	d	fd	Fa	b	b	12
4.	Cd	c	bfc	Bfa	F		c	bC	f	bf	Bf	20
5.		Ba		c	c	bf	fA	fd	bfc	d	f	12
6.		fed	f	b	f	ba	d	f	f	bfa		17
7.	ca		F		BfA	f	f	fc	bcA	f		13
8.	bf	ba	D	b	bc	c	bfD	c	beca		bd	14
9.		ba				c	d		b		bf	14
10.	d			fc		Bfa	c	fc		Fa	fd	8
11.	f	b	fc	bC	bfc	cd	c	c	f	bfa	b	16
12.	bfd	b	b	bf	bD	c	bfCa	c	Bfca	Bfa	bFa	18
13.	B	bFda	a	f			f	fa	c	b	f	27
14.	d	fd	bca	cd		d	b	f	c	b	b	12
15.	cD		cd	bd			d		b	b	d	11
16.	f	b	b	fd	ba	c	d	d	b	fA	f	7
17.	c	fd	f	c	f	f	f	fd	bc		d	12
18.		fb	b	bc	c	c	c		bc	fA	d	12
19.	Fc	C	f	f	c	f	c	fd	cD	f	f	11
20.	fc		b	f	c	f	fc	bfea	c	fD	fA	18
21.	fa		bc	bac	fd	bfd	b	bfea	f			9
22.	cd	f	f		Ca	bD	b	bfea	bfa	f	bd	20
23.	d		d	A	c	b	b	d	d	d	ba	11
24.	fc	bcA	d	c	bf	Bfac	cd	Bfac	bd	b		17
25.	c	bcA	d	c	bc	bfC	c	bfAc	cd	b	b	13
26.	b	bcA	b	c	f	bfC	ca	bfAc	bfAc	b	b	22

TABLE V

SENATE: DISTRICTS ARRANGED IN ORDER OF THE FREQUENCY
OF THEIR REPRESENTATION ON FIVE MAJOR COMMITTEES,
1903-1943

Rank	District	Counties in District	Number of Places on Committees, 1903-1943
1.	13	Jefferson	27
2.	28	Montgomery	25
3.	2	Lawrence, Morgan	22
4.	26	Bullock, Macon	22
5.	4	Madison	20
6.	22	Wilcox	20
7.	32	Greene, Hale	20
8.	12	Fayette, Lamar, Walker	18
9.	20	Marengo	18
10.	6	Etowah, St. Clair	17
11.	24	Barbour	17
12.	11	Tuscaloosa	16
13.	31	Colbert, Franklin, Marion	16
14.	1	Lauderdale, Limestone	15
15.	8	Talladega	14
16.	9	Chambers, Randolph	14
17.	30	Dallas	14
18.	7	Calhoun	13
19.	33	Mobile	13
20.	25	Coffee, Crenshaw, Pike	13
21.	3	Blount, Cullman, Winston	12
22.	5	Jackson, Marshall	12
23.	14	Pickens, Sumter	12
24.	17	Butler, Conecuh, Covington	12
25.	18	Bibb, Perry	12
26.	15	Autauga, Chilton, Shelby	11
27.	19	Choctaw, Clarke, Washington	11
28.	23	Dale, Geneva	11
29.	35	Henry, Houston	11
30.	21	Baldwin, Escambia, Monroe	9
31.	27	Lee, Russell	9
32.	34	Clay, Cleburne, Coosa	9
33.	10	Elmore, Tallapoosa	8
34.	29	Cherokee, DeKalb	8
35.	16	Lowndes	7

TABLE VI
SENATE: COMPARATIVE REPRESENTATION OF NORTH ALABAMA DISTRICTS AND SOUTH ALABAMA DISTRICTS ON FIVE MAJOR COMMITTEES, 1903-1943¹

North Alabama				South Alabama			
Districts	Counties	Times Re- resented	Number of Chairmen	Districts	Counties	Times Re- resented	Number of Chairmen
1. Lauderdale, Limestone		15	0	10. Elmore, Tallapoosa		8	0
2. Lawrence, Morgan		22	1	14. Pickens, Sumter		12	0
3. Blount, Cullman, Winston		12	0	15. Autauga, Chilton, Shelby		11	2
4. Madison		20	4	16. Lowndes		7	0
5. Jackson, Marshall		12	3	17. Butler, Conecuh, Covington		12	1
6. Etowah, St. Clair		17	1	18. Bibb, Perry		12	0
7. Calhoun		13	2	19. Choctaw, Clarke, Washington		11	1
8. Talladega		14	2	20. Marengo		18	3
9. Chambers, Randolph		14	2	21. Baldwin, Escambia, Monroe		9	1
11. Tuscaloosa		16	2	22. Wilcox		20	2
12. Fayette, Lamar, Walker		18	1	23. Dale, Geneva		11	0
13. Jefferson		27	7	24. Barbour		17	2
29. Cherokee, DeKalb		8	1	25. Coffee, Crenshaw, Pike		13	1
31. Colbert, Franklin, Marion		16	1	26. Bullock, Macon		22	4
34. Clay, Cleburne, Coosa		9	1	27. Lee, Russell		9	0
Total		233	28	28. Montgomery		25	1
				30. Dallas		14	2
				32. Greene, Hale		20	1
				33. Mobile		13	3
				35. Henry, Houston		11	1
				Total		275	25

¹ "North Alabama" and "South Alabama" are defined as they were in *Legislative Apportionment*, footnote 11. South Alabama includes all counties (or senatorial districts) lying south of Shelby County including Bibb County, the greater part of which lies south of Shelby. There are 38 of these counties. North Alabama includes all counties (or senatorial districts) lying north of the southern boundary of Shelby. There are 29 of these counties.

TABLE VII
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS BY COUNTIES ON SIX MAJOR COMMITTEES, 1903-1943

County	1903 ¹	1907	1911	1915 ²	1919 ³	1923	1927 ⁴	1931 ⁵	1935 ⁶	1939	1943	Total
Autauga	f	b	c	e	f	c	cd	bca	a		af	5
Baldwin		c	b	b	bcc	cd	bfd	bca	abe		bd	11
Barbour	b	c	b	be			e	bca			abe	24
Bibb	cd	b	ac	f	d		f	f		bf		9
Blount		c		f	f	d	ce	ef		abF		6
Bullock	ebf	fe	E	f	d	d	Aea	feacf	c	af		16
Butler	c	ae	abfe	f	d	Afd	abfd	bcdf	f	ce		21
Calhoun	aeb	bde	de	bceE	fd	b	bd	cd	e	af		32
Chambers	f	cd	b	e			d	fa	a	af		12
Cherokee	ef						cd	cd	bd		c	6
Chilton		c	c	d	bc		e	d	a		ad	9
Choctaw	fd	c	db	d	cd		bd	d	a		b	8
Clarke	b	db		d	cf			b	bc		b	14
Clay				d		b		b			b	8
Cleburne		e	cde	d			c	b	d		b	13
Coffee		c	A	b	c	f	Fe	ef	e	d	d	20
Colbert	fd	ab	A	ab			e	bcead	fE	E	d	6
Conecuh		d	bde	bd	d		cd	ebd	d	f	ae	11
Coosa		c	Bad	d	d		abf	bf	f			13
Covington		c		d	b		e	bed	c	f		10
Crenshaw	c	cf	cd	e		bc	abc	baFc	f			15
Cullman		b	fe	af	acF	b	f	bc	bfe	abe	ef	11
Dale	b	ab	bd	abbce	bd	b	f	f	ab		ef	27
Dallas		Cf				b					d	6
DeKalb		f		f			fe	b	ab		ae	14
Elmore	f	e						b				

TABLE VII (Continued)

	1903 ¹	1907	1911	1915 ²	1919 ³	1923	1927 ⁴	1935 ⁵	1935 ⁶	1939	1943	Total
Pickens.....	bd	d	f	cb	f	c	fd	b	f	d	f	9
Pike.....	c	de	e			b	cfe	bce	c		a	13
Randolph.....	E	e	bc			cfd	cfE	ed	dbc	dd	b	14
Russell.....	bfd	f			c	bD	bcd	bc	d	bf	c	19
Shelby.....	eb	d		de	c	abcf	b	d	a	c		17
St. Clair.....	ed	d	ce	d	c			faeEc	d		Ac	14
Sumter.....	cd	bd	cffe	fd	c	f	ce	cf	fd	ae	cfd	23
Talladega.....	f	b	cf	dee	bf	fd	d	dff	d	fd	fe	20
Tallapoosa.....	cd	bf	bd	bc	bf	aBc	bc	b	be	afe	abfe	30
Tuscaloosa.....	abb	bcf	abcf	bc		cc	ccf	b	b			14
Walker.....	b	bf	ff	B				b				3
Washington.....	f	fe		f	cd		af	a	c	ce		11
Wilcox.....	d		c					d	d	c		5
Winston.....	c											

KEY: Small letters indicate membership on committees; capital letters indicate chairmanships.

a—Rules

b—Judiciary

c—Revision of Laws

d—Local Legislation

e—Appropriations

f—Ways and Means

¹ Mr. Wiggins appears on the Committee on Revision of Laws but not on the roll. Mr. James appears as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and Revision of Laws. His name does not appear on the roll and he was not identified.

² In 1915 there were two Carmichaels in the Legislature. One of them was on the Judiciary Committee, but the Journal does not indicate which one it was.

³ In this session the Ways and Means Committee was combined with Appropriations. It was separated in 1927.

⁴ Mr. Green's name appears as a member of the Committee on Rules, but does not appear in the index or in the House roll.

⁵ Revision of Laws was changed to Civil Laws in this session.

⁶ Local Legislation No. 2, consisting of the entire Jefferson County delegation, is omitted.

TABLE VIII
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: COUNTIES ARRANGED IN ORDER OF THE FREQUENCY OF THEIR REPRESENTATION
ON SIX MAJOR COMMITTEES, 1903-1943

Rank	County	Times Represented	Rank	County	Times Represented
1.	Jefferson	102	35.	Covington	13
2.	Montgomery	58	36.	Lamar	13
3.	Mobile	44	37.	Macon	13
4.	Calhoun	32	38.	Marion	13
5.	Hale	31	39.	Pike	13
6.	Tuscaloosa	30	40.	Chambers	12
7.	Etowah	29	41.	Escambia	12
8.	Lee	29	42.	Baldwin	11
9.	Dallas	27	43.	Coosa	11
10.	Marengo	26	44.	Dale	11
11.	Barbour	24	45.	Wilcox	11
12.	Lauderdale	24	46.	Crenshaw	10
13.	Madison	24	47.	Marshall	10
14.	Morgan	23	48.	Bibb	9
15.	Sumter	23	49.	Chilton	9
16.	Butler	21	50.	Fayette	9
17.	Colbert	20	51.	Geneva	9
18.	Perry	20	52.	Greene	9
19.	Talladega	20	53.	Pickens	9
20.	Tallapoosa	20	54.	Choctaw	8
21.	Russell	19	55.	Clay	8
22.	Jackson	17	56.	Cleburne	8
23.	Shelby	17	57.	Franklin	8
24.	Bullock	16	58.	Lawrence	7
25.	Cullman	15	59.	Limestone	7
26.	Houston	15	60.	Lowndes	7
27.	Monroe	15	61.	Blount	6
28.	Clarke	14	62.	Cherokee	6
29.	Elmore	14	63.	Conecuh	6
30.	Henry	14	64.	DeKalb	6
31.	Randolph	14	65.	Autauga	5
32.	St. Clair	14	66.	Winston	5
33.	Walker	14	67.	Washington	3

TABLE IX

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: COMPARATIVE REPRESENTATION OF NORTH ALABAMA COUNTIES AND SOUTH ALABAMA COUNTIES ON SIX MAJOR COMMITTEES, 1903-1943

North Alabama				South Alabama			
Number	County	Times Rep-resented	Number of Chairmen	Number	County	Times Rep-resented	Number of Chairmen
1.	Blount	6	0	1.	Autauga	5	0
2.	Calhoun	32	4	2.	Baldwin	11	0
3.	Cherokee	6	0	3.	Barbour	24	0
4.	Clay	8	0	4.	Bibb	9	0
5.	Cleburne	8	0	5.	Bullock	16	1
6.	Colbert	20	5	6.	Butler	21	3
7.	Cullman	15	1	7.	Chambers	12	0
8.	DeKalb	6	0	8.	Chilton	9	0
9.	Etowah	29	3	9.	Choctaw	8	0
10.	Fayette	9	0	10.	Clarke	14	0
11.	Franklin	8	0	11.	Coffee	13	0
12.	Jackson	17	0	12.	Conecuh	6	0
13.	Jefferson	102	10	13.	Coosa	11	0
14.	Lamar	13	1	14.	Covington	13	1
15.	Lauderdale	24	2	15.	Crenshaw	10	0
16.	Lawrence	7	0	16.	Dale	11	0
17.	Limestone	7	1	17.	Dallas	27	2
18.	Madison	24	0	18.	Elmore	14	0
19.	Marion	13	0	19.	Escambia	12	0
20.	Marshall	10	0	20.	Geneva	9	2
21.	Morgan	23	4	21.	Greene	9	0

22.	Pickens	9	0	Hale	31
23.	Randolph	14	2	Henry	14
24.	Shelby	17	1	Houston	15
25.	St. Clair	14	0	Lee	29
26.	Talladega	20	0	Lowndes	7
27.	Tuscaloosa	30	1	Macon	13
28.	Walker	14	1	Marengo	26
29.	Winston	5	0	Mobile	44
Total		509	36	Monroe	15
				Montgomery	58
				Perry	20
				Pike	13
				Russell	19
				Sumter	23
				Tallapoosa	20
				Washington	3
				Wilcox	11
				Total	625
					28

TABLE X
SENATE: BILLS REFERRED ON FIRST READING, 1903-1943

Committee	1903	1907	1911	1915	1919	1923	1927	1931	1935	1939	1943	Totals
Judiciary	223	152	199	414	266	168	262	226	90	332	191	2,523
Revision of Laws	131	139	136	166	124	160	112	67	90			1,125
Constitution and Constitutional Revision and Amendments	14	5	4	11	14	8	25	17	29	14	28	169
Finance and Taxation	85	231	61	275	304	162	147	213	137	168	164	1,947
Banking and Insurance	10	16	1	40	24	24	35	96	1			245
Penitentiaries, Prison and Punishment	10	5		27	5		4	6	6			63
Corporations	35	4	15	9	8	4	7	4		2	2	90
Local Legislation	124	392	88	185	144	210	168	315	292	308	246	2,472
Education	63	43	54	89	55	40	53	51	20	38	24	530
Commerce and Common Carriers	16	48	16	37	6	11		12	1	5		152
Mining and Manufacturing	2	8	4	9	4	15	4	5	3	2	1	57
Agriculture	32	20	29	46	23	7	18	15	24	27	25	266
Municipalities and Municipal Organizations	49	18	40	65	65	22	61	32	14	20	41	427
County and County Boundaries	7	4	6	13	1	2	4	6	3		10	56
Immigration, Industrial Resources and Labor	4		1						3		3	11
Public Buildings and Grounds	7		4	2	3							16
Privileges and Elections	22	7	15	28	26	14	15	14	17	14	13	185

Printing	2	11	4	2	3	2	1	1	29
Public Health	18	41	38	12	26	13	20	29	268
Military	5	10	5	8	8	4	6	4	77
Temperance	66	21	8	7	16	5	11	5	250
Rules	16	8	14			2	35	2	80
Fish and Game	11	16	15	8	11	22	9	11	139
Fees and Salaries		37	85	15	27	25	24	32	20
Public Roads and Highways		22					18	11	285
Banking		6					15	13	682
Insurance		9					15	20	572
Federal Relations									
Seaports				2	4	12	8	2	30
Forestry and Conservation							1	17	11
Aviation and Traffic							1	1	292
Public Welfare and Correctional Institutions								1	3
Totals	941	1,242	799	1,552	1,241	901	1,010	1,164	878
							1,061	907	11,696

¹ Divided into two committees for the 1911 session and continuously after 1935.

² Established so recently that the total figure is not a clear measure of activity.

TABLE XI
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: BILLS REFERRED ON FIRST READING, 1903-1943

Committee	1903	1907	1911	1915	1919	1923	1927	1931	1935	1939	1943	Totals
Judiciary	251	334	240	553	369	327	320	182	271	275	177	3,304
Revision of Laws	152	141	222	225	263	167	136	144 ⁴	69	25	66	1,610
Ways and Means	78	91	23	99	309	153	37	131	114	194	155	1,384
Privileges and Elections	22	16	18	37	27	12	32	31	33	16	16	260
Education	95	87	41	126	71	64	28	113	37	37	25	724
Commerce and Common Carriers	41	72	20	53	11	23	11	41	1	12	13	298
Agriculture	35	24	25	94	41	22	30	29	26	30	33	389
Temperance	79	152	42	18	16	5	2	6	11	15	7	353
Local Legislation	156	218	138	217	192	265	365	323	271	285	194	2,624
Appropriations	71	172	126	161	¹	115	115	119	126	98	56	1,044
Corporations	58	24	13	11	10	8	8	6		2	2	142
Penitentiaries and Criminal Administration	21	20	4	25	7	12	5	2				96
Municipal Organization	42	100	42	128	41	61	68	52	4	23	40	601
Banks and Banking	21	15	3	51	34	26	35 ³	31	13	24	32	285
Labor	7	4	1		7	4						23
Public Roads and Highways	70	45	24	59	108	27	40	48	27	39	27	514
Mining and Manufacturing	9	9	5	3	2	11 ²						39
County and County Boundaries	15	22	2	20	5	5	3	2	2	1	3	80
Public Health	25	31	20	55	34	26	42	32	30	46	25	366
Military	5	2	2	11	6	5	11	6	5	7	6	66
Public Buildings and Institutions	1			7		1	5	1		4		19
Capitol and Grounds	2	1	1			4	4	3				11
Game, Fish and Fisheries		22	25	25	26	32	12	30	7	10	25	214
Pensions						20	20	5	3	7	1	36

STANDING COMMITTEES

Federal Relations and Representation	1	1	20	16	17	11	2	2	6
Claims and Fees	14	16	1	12	6	11	2	2	98
Public Printing	5	7	4	11	1	28	11	1	47
Rules	13	6					84	9	185
Insurance and Insurance Companies			10			422	4	22	122
Pensions and Soldiers' Home	9		12	27	1	5	24		97
Pure Food and Drugs				11					11
Constitution and Constitutional Amendments						16	6	23	94
Seaports, Harbors and Maritime Commerce						4	3	21	
Criminal Administration						10	6	2	
Mines and Mining						6	3	1	2
Manufacturing						2	5	2	15
Labor						7	4	14	47
Forestry and Conservation					2	1	6		3
Rivers and Navigation						8		5	14
Eleemosynary Institutions							71	16	93
Criminal Laws							5	2	9
Aviation							56	55	170
Local Legislation No. 2							1	11	40
County Organizations									
Public Welfare and Corrective Institutions							28	8	48
Totals	1,298	1,632	1,084	2,060	1,600	1,301	1,469	1,243	1,297
								1,105	15,625

1 Consolidated with Ways and Means.

2 Abolished; 2 new committees, Manufacturing and Mines and Mining, established.

3 Original name of Banking and Insurance changed to Banks and Banking; new committee on Insurance and Insurance Companies.

4 Civil laws.

TABLE XII
SENATE: COMMITTEE ACTION ON REFERRED BILLS, 1903-1943

Session	Reported Favorably	Reported Favorably as Amended	Reported Favorably with Substitute	Reported without Recommendation	Reported Adversely	Not Reported ¹	Total Bills Introduced
1903.....	699	58	27	2	0	155	941
-1907.....	827	136	39	2	0	242	1,246
1911.....	564	59	23	3	87	8	744
1915.....	977	172	36	0	258	109	1,552
1919.....	805	46	22	7	55	310	1,245
1923.....	596	62	27	1	62	153	901
1927.....	681	53	39	33	129	79	1,014
1931.....	814	73	42	27	33	176	1,165
1935.....	572	55	17	46	20	168	878
1939.....	676	99	35	18	15	220	1,063
1943.....	615	57	25	16	15	180	908
Totals	7,826	870	332	155	674	1,800	11,657
Per Cent of Total	67.3	7.4	2.8	1.3	5.8	15.4	100.0

¹ Because of inadequate records, figures in this column were derived by subtracting the number of bills on which committees acted from the total number referred on first reading. Since many bills which were re-referred are added into the Journal figures on committee reports, the total of all bills reported (first 5 columns) rises and the figures shown in the column "Not Reported" necessarily are minimal.

TABLE XIII
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: COMMITTEE ACTION ON REFERRED BILLS, 1907-1943

Session	Reported Favorably	Reported Favorably as Amended	Reported Favorably with Substitute	Reported without Recommendation	Reported Adversely	Not Reported ¹	Total Bills Introduced
(1903 ²)							(1285)
1907	1,047	147	35	4	332	77	1,612
1911	678	69	18	0	253	77	1,095
1915	1,186	152	52	0	440	219	2,049
1919	1,011	113	39	0	210	207	1,580
1923	728	91	61	3	221	197	1,301
1927	950	71	49	7	257	135	1,469
1931	946	94	70	24	146	280	1,560
1935	691	61	33	47	34	377	1,243
1939	890	81	61	22	6	323	1,298
1943	765	58	35	5	10	231	1,104
Totals	8,802	907	453	112	1,909	2,128	14,311
Per Cent of Total	61.5	6.3	3.2	0.8	13.3	14.9	100.0

¹ See footnote 1, Table XII.

² The House Journals for the 1903 session do not contain the information needed for this table except in total; this fact should be kept in mind in making comparisons with Senate figures. The single figure for 1903 is given for information only; it is not included in the totals.